

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 16, 2007, claims 4, 6, 14 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-16 are now active in this application. No new matter has been added.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in all of the pending claims, if the objections to the specification, objections to claims 4, and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are overcome.

The specification was objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) regarding claims 1, 11, and 16. This objection is traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, as shown below:

1. The term "a plate suction section" in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the suction pads 31 illustrated in FIG 2.
2. The term "a linear motion drive mechanism" has proper antecedent basis in the linear shafts 41a and 41b, the linear motion bases 34a and 34b, and the linear motion drive motor 45 in FIG. 3A.
3. The term "a rotation drive mechanism" in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the pad rotation drive motor 35 in FIG. 2.
4. The term "a linear drive mechanism control" in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the image recording apparatus control section 83 in FIG. 1.
5. The term "a rotation drive mechanism control section" in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the image recording apparatus control section 83 in FIG 1 and the plate supplying apparatus control section 11 in FIG 1.

6. The term “a supplying section” in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the transport rollers 51 and 52 in FIG. 1.

7. The term “a roller section” in claim 1 has proper antecedent basis in the sponge collars 32 in FIG. 2.

Claims 4 and 6 were objected to because of informalities. These claims have been amended as suggested by the Office Action at page 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection has been overcome by amendment.

Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 14 and 15 have been amended to recite “one of the plates,” as suggested by the Office Action at page 3. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been overcome by amendment.

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, Examiner is requested to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Eduardo Garcia-Otero
Registration No. 56,609

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/EG:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: June 18, 2007

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**